# Weekly National Intelligencer.

WASHINGTON: THURSDAY, JULY 14, 1864

## Weekly National Intelligencer.

BY GALES & SEATON. JAMES C. WELLING, ASSOCIATE EDITOR. The subscription price of this paper for a year is Two DOLLARS, payable in advance.

A reduction of 20 per cent. (one-fifth of the full charge will be made to any one who shall order and pay for, at one time, ten copies of the Weekly paper; and a reduction of 25 per cent. (or one-fourth of the full charge) to any one who willorder and pay for, at one time, twenty or more

No accounts being kept for this paper, it will not be sent to any one unless paid for in advance, nor any longer than the time for which it is paid.

REPEAL OF LAWS RECOGNISING SLAVERY.

While the bill making appropriations for sun dry civil expenses of the Government for the year ending the 30th of June, 1865, was under consideration in the Senate, Mr. Senator SUMNER moved certain amendments to which we referred at the time in our brief summary of Congressional proceedings, but which, for their interest and importance, are worthy of a more particular designation.

On the 24th ultimo, while the bill was under discussion in the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, Mr. SUMNER submitted the following amendment to come in as a new section :

"And be it further enacted, That sections eight and nine of the act entitled 'An act to prohibit the importation of slaves into any port or place within the jurisdiction of the United States from and after the 1st day of January, in the year of our Lord 1808, which said sections undertake to regulate the coastwise slave trade, are hereby repealed.

The amendment was opposed by Mr SHERMAN (who had the civil appropriation bill in charge) on the ground of its alleged irrelevancy. To this effect he said :

"I would not oppose the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts on an ordinary bill. I have read the two sections referred to in this amendment, and I feel disposed to repeal them; but I ask the Senate if it is proper to incumber this bill with a matter that is in no way connected with the appropriations in the bill, which is in no way connected with any item contained in the bill, which has no pertinence to any existing appropriation—a matter simply of commercial regulation, regulating the coastwise slave trade?"

Some dissent to the terms of Mr. Sumner's amendment was expressed by Mr. Johnson, of Maryland, on other grounds, when Mr. HEN-DRICKS, of Indiana, spoke as follows:

"I am surprised that any Senator should oppose the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts, for we all know that eventually it will be adopted. The objection as to its materiality or proper connection with this measure is but an objection of time. No gentleman can question that the Senator from Massachuset's will eventually carry his proposition. Why, sir, about two weeks ago this body, after full discussion, deliberately voted that the this body, after full discussion, deliberately voted that the Constitution imposed a duty upon Congress and the President of the United States; the present incumbent of the presidential chair in his inaugural address said that that rested as an oath upon the conscience of every Senator to see that there was an efficient and adequate law for the return of fugitive slaves; and yet under some process, not the force of argument, but through some influence that the uninitiated cannot understand, after the Senate had reject ed the proposition in its original form, it was carried through yesterday by a large vote. Why then contest the matter longer? Let the Senator bring his propositions. The Senator from Ohio (Mr. SHERMAN) made an effort to stay the progress at one point upon the Constitution, and did for a while save the act of 1793 and the signature of George Washington; but the Senator from Onio finally failed yesterday, and it all went by the board. He may for this hour and in this debate, upon a, technical point, prevent the adoption of the measure of the Senator from body I have no doubt. It may as well come now as at

On the following day, the 25th of June, the bill still being under discussion in the Committee of the Whole, a vote was had on Mr. Sumner's amendment, and it was rejected by the following vote. (The amendment, we should add, had in the mean time been perfected by its author so as to provide not only for the repeal of the sections designated in the act regulating the coastwise slave trade, but to prohibit that trade forever :)

YEAS-Messrs. Conness, Grimes, Harlan, Howard,

Sprague, Sumner, Wade, and Wilson—13.
NAYS—Messrs. Buckslew, Carlile, Clark, Collamer,
Cowan, Davis, Harris, Hendricks, Hicks, Howe, Johnson, McDougall, Nesmith, Powell, Richardson, Riddle, Sauls-bury, Sherman, Trumbuil, and Van Winkle—20. ABSENT—Messrs Anthony, Brown, Chandler, Dixon, Doolittle, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Hale, Harding, Hen derson, Lane of Indiana, Ten Eyck, Wilkinson, Willey, and Wright-16.

So the amendment was rejected in Committee of the Whole. But, nothing baffled by such a result. Mr. SUMNER again offered the same amendment on the same day when the bill was before the Senate pending its final passage. On renew-

ing the proposition he said: "I have but one observation to make. It seems to me this Congress will do wrong to itself, wrong to the country, wrong to history, wrong to our national cause if it neparates without cleaning the statute-book of every support of slavers. Now, this is the last support that there is in the statute-book, and I entreat the Senate to re-

The question being taken by yeas and nays, resulted as follows:

YEAS-Mesers. Anthony, Brown, Chandler, Connes Dixon, Doubtie, Fessenden, Foot, Harlan, Harris, How ard, Howe, Lane of Kansas, Morgan, Morrill, Pemeroy Sprague, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Wade, Wilkinson, and Wil-

NAYS-Messrs. Buckalew, Carlile, Clark, Hendricks, Hicks, Johnson, Lane of Indians, Nesmith, Powell, Richardson, Saulsbury, Sherman, Trumbull, Van Winkle, and Willey—14.

ABSENT—Messrs. Collamer, Cowan, Davis, Foster, Grimes, Hale, Harding, Henderson, McDougall, Ramsey, Riddle, and Wright—12.

So the amendment was agreed to, and remained in the bill as finally passed by both Houses of Congress and approved by the President.

It will be seen that Mr. SUMNER, at this point of the discussion, referred to this regulation of the coastwise slave trade as "the last support of slavery" on the statute-book of the nation. He used this language because on the same day, in an earlier stage of the discussion, he had procured the adoption of an amendment providing that in the courts of the United States there shall be no exclusion of any witness on account of color.

The third section of the civil appropriation bill appropriated \$100,000 in order to aid the admin- who at the former date had voted to retain the istration of justice, especially in order to bring to fugitive slave law of 1798, Messrs. Dixon and conviction persons engaged in counterfeiting Treasury notes, bonds, or other securities of the United mer, Doolittle, Foster, Hendricks, Henderson, States, as well as the coin of the United States. Nesmith, and Sherman were absent or did not vote In order to accomplish that result something more on the latter occasion. than an appropriation of money was deemed by Mr. | The question then being taken on the final pas-Summer to be needed, to wit, an amendment of the sage of the bill, it was decided in the affirmative declining for the last few months. But, as we are law of evidence. Accordingly he offered the fol- by the following vote:

lowing amendment by way of proviso to the third

"Provided, That in the courts of the United States

On motion of Mr. BUCKALEW, of Pennsylvania, the amendment was amended so as to provide that there should be in the same courts no exclusion of any witness "in civil actions because he is a party to or interested in the issue tried." And the question being taken on the amendment as thus amending vote:

YEAS—Messrs. Anthony, Brown, Chandler, Clark, Collamer, Conness, Foot, Foster, Grimes, Hale, Harlan, Howard, Howe, Lane of Kansas, Morgan, Morrill, Pomeroy, Sprague, Sumner, Wade, Wilkinson, and Wilson—22 NAYS—Messrs. Buckalew, Carlile, Cowan, Davis, Har ris, Hendricks, Hicks, Johnson, Nesmith, Powell, Richardson, Saulsbury, Sherman, Trumbull, Van Winkle, and

ABSENT-Messrs Dixon, Doolittle, Fessenden, Harding. Heuderson, Lane of Indians, McDougall, Ramsey, Riddell, Ten Eyck, and Wright—11.

So the amendment was agreed to in Committee of the Whole, and when it came up for final action by the Senate, was reaffirmed as follows:

YEAS-Messrs Anthony, Brown, Chandler, Clark, Con ness, Dixon, Doolittle, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Grimer Hale, Harlan, Harris, Howard, Howe, Lane of Indiana Lane of Kansas, Morgan, Morrill, Pomerny, Ramsey, Sherman, Sprague, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Wade, Wilkinson, and Wilson—29.

and Wilson—29.

NAYS—Messrs. Buckalew, Carlile, Hendricks, Hicks, Nesmith, Powell, Saulsbury, Trumbull, Van Winkle, and Willey—10.

ABSENT—Messrs. Collamer, Cowan, Davis, Harding, Henderson, Johnson, McDougall, Richardson, Riddle, and

This provision is, therefore, now the law of the

The success of Mr. Senator Sumner in procuring, on a previous day of the session just closed. against all opposition and dilatory motions, the passage of "An act to repeal the fugitive slave act of 1850, and all acts and parts of acts for the rendition of fugitive slaves," was a still higher tribute to his acknowledged leadership in the body of which he is a member. When this measure was first introduced by him in the Senate it was, after much discussion, brought to a shape which still retained the provisions of the law of 1793 under this head, as approved by President Washington. Many Republican Senators expressly stated in open Senate that, under a sense of what was due to the oath they had taken to support the Constitution of the United States, they could not vote to repeal all acts for the rendition of fugitive slaves. This view was elaborately urged and eloquently enforced by Mr. Senator Foster, of Connecticut, in a speech which we have printed at length. And this view prevailed in the Senate on the 19th of April last, when Mr. SHERMAN, of Ohio, offered the following amendment to the bill as originally introduced by Mr. SUMNER to repeal all acts for the reclamation of fugitive slaves:

"Except the act approved February 2, 1793, entitled 'An act respecting fugitives from justice and persons escaping from the service of their matters."

The question on the amendment being taken by yeas and nays, resulted as follows:

YEAS-Messrs Buckalew, Car'ile, Collamer, Cowan, Davis, Dixon, Doolittle, Foster, Harris, Henderson, Hen-

mith, Powell, Ridd'e, Saulebury, Sherman, Tex Eyck, Trumbull, Van Winkle, atd Willey—24.

Nays—Messrs. Anthony, Brown, Clark, Conness, Fessenden, Grimes, Hale, Howard, Lane of Kansas Morgan, Morrill, Pomeroy, Ramsey, Sprague, Sumner, Wilkinson, and Wilson—17. So the amendment was agreed to.

Some weeks later the House of Representatives passed a bill for the repeal of all these statutes in the same terms as that originally introduced by Mr. SUMNER in the Senate, and this bill having been sent to the latter body was on the 21st ultimo

called up for consideration by Mr. SUMNER. Mr. DooLITTLE, of Wisconsin, moved to post pone it for the purpose of taking up the bill providing for a repeal of the commutation clause in the enrollment set. Thereupon Mr. SUMNER spoke as follows :

"The speech of the Senator belongs to the class of what may be called dilatory motions, or a speech to sustain a dilatory motion. He announces to us that there is to be an opposition to this bill, and mentions several Senators who menace speeches. If those speeches are to come, I say let us hear them and be done with them, because that bill from the House must be passed by Congress during this session. The Senstor wishes to have it postponed; he wishes to set aside what the House has done; and he thinks the strength of the sension of the sens thinks that those who press the bill which now has the sanction of the House want practical sense. Sir, permit me to say to that Senator it is himself who wants practical sense. He fails to see the requirements of his country at this hour; he fails to see what is due to the civilization of the age; and in that respect he shows a want of practical sense in the highest degree. Sir, I do not wish to say any thing personal to that Senator; but when he makes the suggestion that any one on this floor wants practical sense. I throw it back upon him, when he stands up here to arrest a bill that has already passed the House of Representatives to sweep from the statute book of the land a system of legislation which at this moment is an infamy. If there the age; and in that respect he shows a want of practica is any thing which now brings upon our cause in foreign lauds discredit, and makes it a burden to our friends, it is this very act which at this moment receives indirectly the support of the Senator from Wisconsin; and yet he rise here to taunt us for the want of practical sense he seeks to uphold even indirectly this act he wants practical patriotism as well as practical sense

On the 23d of June Mr. SUMNER succeeded in bringing the Senate to a vote on the bill. Imme diately previous to the final vote Mr. Johnson of Maryland, moved to except from the scope of the bill the act of 1793, thus calling on the Senate to adhere to the stand it had solemnly taken on the 19th of April. But his amendment to this effect was now rejected by the following vote:

YEAS—Mesers. Buckalew, Carlile, Cowan, Davis, Harris, Hicks, Johnson, Lans of Indiana, McDougall, Powell, Richardson, Riddle, Saulsbury, Ten Eyck, Trumbull, Van Winkle, and Willey—17.

NAYS-Messrs. Anthony, Brown, Chandler, Clark, Conness, Dixon, Fessenden, Foot, Grimes, Hale, Harlan, Howard, Howe, Lane of Kansas, Morgan. Morrill, Poneroy, Ramsey, Sprague, Sumner, Wade, and Wilson—22.

ABSENT—Messrs. Collamer, Doolittle, Foster, Harding, Henderson, Hendricks, Nesmith, Sherman, Wilkinson, and Wright—10.

The difference of this result, as compared with that reached on the same proposition on the 19th of April, arose from the fact that among those Howe changed their votes, while Messrs. Colla-

YEAS—Messrs. Authory, Brown, Chandler, Clark, Conness. Dixon, Fessenden, Foot, Grimes. Hale, Harlan, Harris, Hicks, Howard, Howe, Laue of Indiana, Lane of

Harris, Hicks, Howard, Howe, Laue of Indiana, Lane of Kansas, Morgan, Morrill, Pomeroy, Ramsey, Sprague, Sumner, Teu Eyck, Trumbull, Wade, and Wilson—27.

NAYS—Messrs. Buckalew, Carlile, Cowan, Davis, Johnson, McDougall, Powell, Richardson, Riddle, Saulsbury, Van Winkle, and Willey—12.

ABSENT—Messrs. Collamer, Doolittle, Foster, Harding, Hendricks, Nesmith, Sherman, Wilkinson, and Wright—10.

So the bill was passed as it came from the House of Representatives, and in the same terms as Mr. Sumner had conceived his original bill on the subject.

We have referred to these acts of legislation and to the leading part which Senator SUMNER had in their enactment, because their passage serves to mark a new epoch in our parliamentary history. It is no reflection on the talents or influence of any other member of the Senate to say that these measures could not have been passed under the direction of any Senator less tenacious in his convictions of public duty or less capable of enforcing them by argument than the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. His political friends in many instances would have willingly evaded or postponed them, but we see in what he was able to accoun plish, in the face of this obvious reluctance, only new illustration of the supremacy fairly achieved by those who wish strongly where they wish at all. Mr. SUMNER is an earnest anti-slavery man, and if there were those among his political friends who at first sought, for one reason or another, to escape some of the conclusions to which he challenged their adhesion, he finally succeeded in vindicating for his measures either the active support or passive acquiescence of the recalcitrants in his party, with the single exception, we believe, of Mr. Cowan, of Pennsylvania, who, having convictions of public duty equally strong with those of Senator SUMNER, though pointing in a different direction, was not moved from his steadfastness, but proved the integrity of his opinons by an unblenching adherence to what he believed the obligations imposed on him by his oath of office. Those who may not concur with him in his view of duty will at least honor him for having had the "courage of his opinions." Being equally clear in his convictions of constitutional duty when called on the 19th of April and on the 23d of June to vote upon the question of repealing the law of 1793 in relation to fugitive slaves, he did not vote differently on the different occasions, and thus proved that if he voted in the first place to retain that law, it was from no consideration less imperious than a constraining sense of constitutional duty, and that if he did not vote, in the second place, to repeal it, he refrained from acting in opposition to the abiding sense of that duty, and thus equally preserved a conscience void of offence in his own eyes and in the eyes of his countrymen. Those who voted differently on the different occasions, or who purposely abstained from voting at all on the latter occasion, were doubtless equally sincere and equally able to justify their conduct; but they could not have been at all times as clear in their intellectual conceptions of public duty as those who were of a constant mind in the matter of their votes on this important question.

# PARTISAN EXAGGERATION.

We have always been in the habit of looking to the North American Review for the reflection of ideas which appeal to the intelligence and candor of the public. Its views of political affairs under former editors have always been positive and definite, but they were stated without exaggeration and without partisan vehemence. Its present conductors, we regret to observe, prescribe to themselves a different rule of conduct, and address a different class of readers. They have impressed on the Review a character for partisanship which does not require respect for even the appearance of accuracy in a statement that appeals to current political hatreds. For instance, in the July number just received, in an article on the "National Currency," we read as follows:

"A Union victory on a battle field or at the polls de presses the price of gold; a rebel victory in the South or at a Northern election sends it up. Jefferson Davis, the Southern armice, Generals Longstreet and Lee, and the Northern Democrats are the bulls of the gold market; Lincoln, Chase, Grant, Sherman, and Meac market; Lincoln, Chase, Grant, Sherman, and Meade, our brave troops, and the loyal and patriotic men of the North are the bears. Gold will fall as they rise in power, and the legal-tender notes, if skillfully managed by the Trensury, as the great war draws to a successful close, will increase in value, and when it ends be at par every where, and, like the notes of the Bank of the United States, sometimes and in some places, above par."

Every body knows that there is no foundation for this statement, so far as it affirms that "a Union victory at the polls depresses the price of gold," or that a "rebel victory" in a "Northern election" causes a rise in the price of gold. By a "Union victory at the polls" the writer means a Republican triumph, and by a "rebel victory" a success of the party opposed to the Administration. And yet, with the blind fatuity of the partisan, he establishes a connection of cause and effect, where every reader is able to penetrate its fallacy; for every body knows that at the last elections which have been held in the country the Republican party has prevailed, even in States previously Democratic, by majorities the most overwhelming and unprecedented, and as it is certain that the price of gold has subsequently gone up with accelerated velocity, the truth of the writer's statement can be substantiated only on the supposition that the Administration party is the party whose triumph has had the effect of a "rebel victory." And then, if the reviewer's analysis of the monetary situation be exhaustive or sound as far as it goes, when he says that legal-tender notes will increase in value "as the war draws to a successful close," it follows that, according to his logic, the prospect of "a successful close of the war" is growing constantly less and less, for Treasury notes, instead of "increasing in value" as measured by gold, have been steadily

to the passions a meaning which they contradict to the passions a meaning which they contradict to the reason of every reader. We hope the North American Review will leave a monopoly of this style to the professional partisan press. Besides, something more of vivacity is pardoned to the heate of deily journalism, than to the deliberation to the deliberation will be at a severa that I want to make a motion.

Mr. Pendleton. I desire, when the gentleman from Massachusetts says that an event occurred on Wednesday on the contingency of which the proclamation was or was not to be issued, to know what that contingency was.

Mr. Pendleton. I desire, when the gentleman from Massachusetts says that an event occurred on Wednesday on the contingency of which the proclamation was or was not to be issued, to know what that contingency was.

Mr. Stevens. Before the gentleman from Massachusetts says that an event occurred on Wednesday on the contingency of which the proclamation was or was not to be issued, to know what that contingency was.

Mr. Pendleton. I desire, when the gentleman from Massachusetts says that an event occurred on Wednesday on the contingency of which the proclamation was or was not to be issued, to know what that contingency was.

Mr. Pendleton. I desire, when the gentleman from Massachusetts says that an event occurred on Wednesday on the contingency of which the proclamation was or was not to be issued, to know what that contingency was.

Mr. Pendleton. I desire, when the gentleman from Massachusetts says that an event occurred on Wednesday on the contingency of which the proclamation was or was not to be issued, to know what that contingency was. of a periodical which speaks only four times a year. We are the more emboldened to make this suggestion to the leading quarterly of our country because we are pleased to find in another article of the current number some judicious reflections on

grave questions of public concern, to which we

A HISTORICAL ENIGMA. In the course of a discussion that was had the House of Representatives on the 25th ultimo Mr. MALLORY, of Kentucky, expressed the opinion that the whole theory of the Administration in the conduct of the war had been changed by the preliminary proclamation of emancipation issued by Mr. Lincoln on the 22d of September, 1862; and he further intimated a belief that it was the "pressure" of certain Republican Governors, assembled in convention at Altoona, in Pennsylvania, which, in connection with other influences tending to the same end, had caused the President to abandon his original policy in this matter. It was in the presence of this statement that Mr. BOUTWELL, of Massachusetts, (well known as an urgent patron of the proclamation, and who at the time of its promulgation was holding an important office in the Treasury Department,) rose in his place in the House of Representatives and made the following

announcement, which elicited much curiosity : Mr. BOUTWELL. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MALLORY) said this morning that the whole policy of the country was changed by the proclamation of the President, and he attributed that proclamation to the meeting of the Governors of certain States at Altoena. I am not here to be put upon the witness stand, but it so happens that I have the means of knowing that the proclamation September, 1862, was entirely independent of and ante dent to the meeting of the Governors at Altoona. The meeting of the Governors had no connection with the prociamation. The gentleman from Kentucky should remember that prior to the ssuing of that proclamation we had met with but few successes, and that we had endured many, many referees. Lee had battled for four days under the fortifications of the capital, and had finally crossed the Po tomac into Maryland. It was not until the country put itself on the side of justice that it had a right to expect the favor of Divine Providence, or any of those successes which have rendered this war glorious in the cause of free

lom, truth, and justice.

Mr. Mallory. Will the gentleman state when tha Mr. Mallory. Will the gentlemen state when that convention of Governors assembled at Altoona?

Mr. Boutwell. I think it assembled at Altoona previous to the 22d of September, but I assert as within my own knowledge that the issuing of the proclamation was determined upon previous to the meeting at Altoona.

Mr. Mallory. Can the gentleman inform me when the issuing of that proclamation was determined upon?

Mr. Boutwell. I cannot go far in this matter. I assert distinctly the fact which is within my own knowledge that the President previous to the meeting of the Governors at Altoona had decided in a certain contingency, which happened upon the Wednesday preceding the 22d of Septemhappened upon the Wednesday preceding the 22d o the proclamation, and therefore the inference I draw is in contravention of the declaration of the gentle man from Kentucky that that proclamation was the result of the meeting of the Governors at Altoona.

Mr. MALLORY. Will the gentleman tell us the Mr. BOUTWELL. I said, Mr. Speaker, when I mentioned

knowledge, and history will confirm the statement. Mr. Mallory. If the gentleman from Massachusetts does not wish to answer the question or to state the fact I Lovejoy wrote:

will not insist.

Mr. BOUTWELL. I have done nothing more than thisto put my statement of a fact, which I assert to be within my own knowledge, against the declaration of the gentleman from Kentucky that the proclamation of emancipation, or the monitory proclamation of emancipation, was issued in consequence of the meeting of Governors at Al

Mr. MALLORY. We know that the President himsel issuing such a proclamation, and that he argued against ssuing it. I want to know from the gentleman from Massachusetts whether it was between the 13th and 22d, and if so, at what point between these two periods, the Presiient had prepared the proclamation and o issue it upon a certain contingency. I would also like Mr. BOUTWELL. The gentleman from Kentucky is good

t questioning, but I have to keep myself within the posi Mr. Dawes. Courtesy is an exchangeable commodity.

Mr. BOUTWELL. I trust I shall lose nothing by m

Mr. MALLORY. Of course not. I decline to sak any

We thus have it distinctly stated by Mr. Bour-WELL, as a fact within his own personal knowdetermined to issue it upon "a certain contingeney," and that this particular contingency, upon which were suspended results so momentous, happened on the Wednesday preceding the 22d of September, on which day the edict was issued. But what this "contingency" was Mr. Boutwell persistently declined to say. For, after he had reon the subject, the following colloquy ensued:

Mr. PENDLETON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question before he passes from the subject he is now discussing? Mr. BOUTWELL. Certainly.

Mr PENDLETON. I desire to ask the gentlemen whe her he knows when the proclamation of the President was finally agreed upon?—not when it was issued, for we all know that; but I have no doubt the gentleman knows when it was decided upon
Mr. BOUTWELL. The gentleman from Ohio secribes to

me a knowledge which I have never claimed.

Mr. PENDLETON. He has given the House and the country to understand that it was agreed upon before the Mr. BOUTWELL. I have not given the House or the

sonntry to understand that it was agreed upon at any Mr PENDLETON. When the gentleman says that it was agreed upon or determined upon that it should be issued before a certain time, as I certainly understood him to ssy-knows it was determined upon, or that the President desired to issue it prior to the Wednesday before the 22d f September, when it was issued-and that its being is su'd depended upon a contingency which was expected to happen and did happen on that Wednesday, I desire him to answer, if he is at liberty to answer, and if he is not to say

Mr. Boutwell. I gave notice in the outset that I did not mean to be drawn into any explanation beyond the

tstement which I made
Mr. PENDLETON. I desire to know, then, whether it was the gentleman's purpose, when he made the announce put upon the witness-stand, to simply state to the House such parts of a transaction which he says was within his own knowledge as he may see fit, and that he will not be induced to state any thing beyond?
Mr. BOUTWELL, Exactly.

was intended to be issued, but declines to state it to the sure the author does not intend to say all this, it House. "

he will not be cross-examined, and I do not see any advantage to be gained by keeping him longer on the witness

mr. PENDLETON. I beg that the gentleman will wait until this matter is settled.

Mr. STEVENS. But the gentleman from Massachusetts persists in saying that he will not be examined, and all the gentleman's questions therefore will avail nothing.

Mr. PENDLETON. I desire to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts upon what event happening on a certain Wednesday the issuing of the President's emancipation message was contingent?

Mr. BOUTWELL. The wisdom of the remark with which

shall call the attention of our readers at an early

Mr. Boutwell. The wisdom of the remark with which I prefaced my first statement is more and more manifest as I proceed. The questions put to me are not founded upon any thing I have said. The gentleman's question states that the event was to happen on Wednesday.

Mr. PENDLETON. It did happen on Wednesday.

Mr. Boutwell. I have already stated to my friends on that side of the House that I do not intend to answer that question. With all due respect to them, I do not in tend to answer that question. I stated just exactly what I wanted to say, for the purpose of repelling, so far as I could, the imputation that the President was controlled in issuing his emancipation proclamation by any assembly of men any where. If what the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MALLORY) has asserted be true, of which I have no knowledge, then so much higher is my opinion of the (Mr. MALLORY) has asserted be true, of which I have no knowledge, then so much higher is my opinion of the President's wisdom that he abandoned a policy which had brought nothing but disaster upon the country, and raised himself to the contemplation of the supreme truth that justice to the enslaved was involved in the contest, and that neither he nor the country could hope for the blessing of God until they saw the injustice of slavery, and deter-mined by one supreme decree to strike down slavery and

Mr. PENDLETON. Will the gentlemen yield to me?

Mr. BOUTWELL Certainly.
Mr PENDLETON. I ask the gentleman whether the issuing of that proclamation did not depend upon a victor being obtained by the Union forces ? I will be satisfied with mr. Boutwell. In regard to these questions, I have

already said twould not answer.

The SPEAKER. Whenever the gentleman declines to yield the Chair will protect him in his right to the floor.

Mr. Pendleton. The gentlemen yielded to me to put

Mr. PENDLETON. The gentlemen yielded to me to put the question and he declines to answer it.

Mr. BOUTWELL. I made the declaration in the beginning that I would not be put upon the stand as a witness in reference to any particular statement I made; that I in tended to make a statement and leave it there for what it was worth. I have yielded to the gentleman many times, an excess of courtesy which has borne heavily upon the patience of the House, and yet he still persists in putting the same question to me.

Mr. PENDLETON. I understood the gentleman to say that that proclamation did not depend on the meeting of any set of men. Do I understand the gentleman to say that n its broadest and fullest extent?

Mr. BOUTWELL. Having met the inquiries and decla

rations of the gentleman from Kentucky in reference to the Governors at Altoons, with the consent of the Chair this business of interruption is at an end.

Mr. Pendleron. Certainly I will not persist in my interruptions if not agreeable to the gentleman.

Our readers know that the battle of Antietam was fought and won by Gen. McClellan on the "Wednesday preceding the 22d of September, 1862," and it was doubtless to this fact that Mr. Pendleton alluded when he asked Mr. Boutwell if "the issuing of that proclamation did not depend upon a victory being obtained by the Union forces' And he had good reason for suspecting that that was the "contingency" to which Mr. Boutwell alluded, for it will be remembered that the late Mr. Owen Lovejoy, of Ohio, in a letter published during the last winter, and which was never contradicted, stated that the President had informed him that the proclamation was held in reserve to he issued on the occasion of a victory, when its utterance would come with authority and not seem in the eyes of the insurgents and of the world to this fact, that I was not to be put upon the stand as a wit. In the eyes of the insurgents and of the world to ness. I have made a statement as of a fact within my own be a cry of despair extorted from conscious weakness in an hour of extremity. To this effect Mr.

"Recurring to the President, there are a great many reports concerning him which seem to be reliable and authentic, which, after all, are not so. It was currently re ported among the anti-slavery men of Illinois that the emancipation proclamation was exterted from him by the outward pressure, and particularly by the delegation from the Christian Convention that met at Chicago. Now, the fact is this, as I had it from his own lps. He had written the proclamation in the summer, as early as June, I think, but will not be certain as to the precise time, and called his Cabinet together, and informed them he had written it and he meant to make it; but wanted to read it to them for any criticism or remarks as to its features or detail After having done so, Mr. Seward suggested whether after we had gained some substantial advantage in the field that time we had met with many reverses, and it might be considered a cry of despair. thought the suggestion a wise one, and so held on to the proclamation until after the battle of Antietam."

It is in the presence of the statements made by Mr. Boutwell and by Mr. Lovejoy that the mystery which broods over the motive and origin of the emancipation proclamation becomes only more and more inscrutable. Mr. Boutwell informs us ledge, that the President, previous to the date of that it is within his own knowledge that, previous the promulgation of his emancipation edict, had to the date of its utterance, the President "had decided in a certain contingency, which happened upon the Wednesday preceding the 22d of September, to issue the proclamation;" and Mr. Lovejoy informs us that this "contingency" was a it come to pass that, only nine days before the emancipation proclamation was officially promulged, the fused to answer the interrogatories of Mr. Mallory President, in reply to the urgent pressure of the Chicago deputation, assigned at such great length and with such earnestness the reasons which demonstrated to his mind the impolicy of any such measure on general grounds? If we are to believe Mr. Boutwell and Mr. Lovejoy, the President had determined to issue this proclamation, in a certain contingency, at the very time when he was arguing against it to the Chicago memorialists in this wise:

"What good would a proclamation of emancipation from me do, especially as we are now situated? I do not want to issue a document that the whole world will see must necessarily be inoperative, like the Pope's bull against the comet. Would my word free the slaves, when I cannot even enforce the Constitution in the rebel States? Is there a single court, or magistrate, or individual that there to think it would have any greater effect upon the slaves than the late law of Coogress, which I approved and which offers protection and freedom to the slaves of rebel masters who come within our lines? Yet I cannot learn that that law has caused a single slave to come over

Now, then, tell me, if you please, what possible result of good would follow the issuing of such a proclamation as you desire! Understand, I raise no objections against ! legal or constitutional grounds; for, as commander-in chief of the army and navy, in time of war, I suppose I have a right to take any measure which may best subdue the enemy. Nor do I urge objections of a moral nature. in view of possible consequences of insurrection and massacre at the South. I view the matter as a practical war

It will be seen that these views of the proclamation are general in their nature, applying to it as well after as before the battle of Antietam. Now, of \$300,000,000.

Mr. STEVENS. The gentleman from Massachusetts says what were the considerations which caused the President so suddenly and at the same time so radically to change his convictions of the expediency of this policy? We regret that we heve never had any light on this point.

# THE INVASION OF MARYLAND.

The attention of the country has during the last nine or ten days been attracted to certain undefined and desultory movements of the enemy in the neighborhood of Harper's Ferry.

A portion of the forces lately co-operating with the army of Gen. Lee in the defence of Richmond, after penetrating the valley of the Shenandoah. seems to have so far eluded the vigilance-perhaps we should say, presuming on the carelessness-of the Federal commanders in the region of the Upper Potomac that the nature and extent of the irruption were not developed until the enemy, as it now appears, was able to effect an entrance into Marvland with a considerable force—the main body of this force masking its movements by what at first seemed to be little more than the predatory operations of guerrilla troops, engaged in a plundering forayfrather than meditating a serious demonstration.

But within the last few days it has become evident that a considerable body of the enemy has been detached on this expedition, in the hope doubtless of creating a diversion in favor of Gen. Lee, by exciting such an alarm for the safety of Washington, or of its communications with the North, as would have for its effect to cause Gen. Grant to raise the siege of Petersburg and abandon his campaign against Richmond.

We have, however, the best reason to believe that the enemy has entirely miscalculated the bearing of his demonstration, which, we do not doubt, will be promptly repelled, without producing any interruption in the plans of Gen. Grant, who was not unprepared for the movement of the enemy in this direction.

The measures taken by the War Department are believed to be entirely adequate to meet the emergency, and little excitement has prevailed in this city since the proportions of the incursion have been fully developed within the last day or two.

Senators Wade, Chandler, Sprague, Ram-SEY, and WILKINSON, who made a visit last week on a special steamer to Lieut. Gen. GRANT's headquarters, returned to Washington on Saturday night. During their stay they made an excursion to the outer lines of our army, and viewed the rebel outposts from our picket defences. They represent the army, we are happy to learn, as comfortable as could be expected, under the awful heat and drought which have prevailed for weeks past. We understand also that Gen. Grant expresses confidence in his ultimate success, his army being as strong as he desires it, and even able to spare as many men as necessary to repel the invasion of Maryland, which indeed he had anticipated, and in prospect of which he had already dispatched a body of troops to Gen. Wallace

# SHORT NOTES ON NEW BOOKS

ILLUSTRATIONS OF UNIVERSAL PROGRESS.—A Series of Discussions by HERBERT SPENCER New York: Appleton & Co, 1864. Washington: Blanchard & Mobun.

FIRST PRINCIPLES OF A NEW SYSTEM OF PHILOSOPHY By HERBERT SPENCER. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1864. Washington: Blanchard & Mohun.

These works have come to us with much heralding, designed to procure for them the honors awarded to those who make new discoveries in the world of thought. And yet, with every disposition to recognise in Mr. Spencer a writer of much acuteness, we are not quite prepared, with some of his indiscreet admirers, to rank him with Aris totle and Bacon, as the founder of a new organon.

The first-named of the above entitled works is a collect tion of essays contributed to the English Reviews. The articles on the Nebular Hypothesis, and on Illogical Geology, in this volume, are very interesting discussions of subjects of the first interest in physical science. The papers on Manners and Fashion, on the Physiology of Laughter, on the Development Hypothesis, and on the Use of Beauty, are full of subtle observation expressed with rare felicity of diction.

The second of the productions above-named is the first volume of a series in which it is designed to unfold the principles of Mr. Herbert Spencer's "new philosophy." It is divided into two parts, the aim of the first being to determine the true sphere of all rational investigation by rightly discriminating between the knowable and the unknowable, and of the second to elucidate and apply the fundamental principles of science in laying the basis of a true and positive philosophy. Readers who are familiar with the writings of Sir Wm. Hamilton and of Auguste Comte will not find much that is new to them in the "Union victory." But, if this be true, how did writings of Mr. Spencer, however widely his method may differ from that of either the Scotch or French thinker.

> SPIRITUALISM TESTED : Or, the Facts of its History Classified and their Cause in Nature verified from Ancient and Modern Testimonies. By GEO. W. SAMSON, D.D. President of Columbian College. Boston: Gould of Lincoln, 1864. Washington: Shepherd & Riley.

We are glad to find that a new edition of this work has been demanded by the public, for it is one of real learning and true merit on the subject to which it relates -- a subject which in the hands of charlatans has been made the means of gross popular delusion, and which it has been too common for men of science altogether to ignore, as though the phenomena connected with it were unworthy of serious attention. In this treatise the esteemed writer, well known among us as the learned President of Columbian College, has collated the phenomena of "spiritualism," so called, for the purpose of showing that they have a cause in nature, and are not at all peculiar to our land or times, and have their recognised place in the history of literature. To this portion of his work Dr Samson has brought a wide range of reading in the literature of both ancient and modern times.

The merit of this production has procured for it the homage of the most enlightened inquirers in this branch of investigation, among whom we may particularly signalize the name of Count Agenor de Gasparin, well anown in our country for his recent works on the aspects of our war and who in his Tables Tournautes repeatedly pays the highest tributes to the learning and argument of Dr. Samson, as contained in the volume before us. We have no doubt that Dr. S. has here stated the true rationale of the phenomena which are popularly known under the much abused name of " aniritualism."

Lewis expresses the opinion that the receipts from internal revenue for the next fiscal year will reach the large figure